

U.S. Appl. Serial No. 10/801,769
Response to Office Action dated June 21, 2005
Page 2 of 6

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-7, 9, and 17-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 4, 7, 9, and 17-20 were rejected. Claims 1 and 17 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

1. **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112**

The Examiner rejected claims 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant respectfully disagrees, traverses the rejection and request reconsideration. In the specification at page 1, paragraph 0003, Applicant specifically discloses that an advantage of airbeds is that airbeds can be deflated, virtually eliminating the space used by the mattress, when used with a sleeper sofa. See also, page 2, paragraph 0004 which discloses that an airbed mattress can be deflated before the bed is folded into the couch. Applicant believes there is ample support in the specification for two bladders "capable of being folded into a sleeper sofa."

2. **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-7, 9, and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shepherd (U.S. Pat. No. 495,850). Claims 1 and 17 have been amended to provide that the "first and second bladders are capable of being folded into a sleeper sofa when not in use" and "folding said first and second bladders into a sleeper sofa when not in use," respectively. As discussed above, there is support in the specification for these amendments. Shepherd does not teach or suggest that her four part mattress is capable of being folded into a sleeper sofa when not in use and there is no motivation for one skilled in the art to modify Shepherd to supply the missing limitation. It is believed that all claims, as now amended, patentably distinguish over the cited art and allowance is earnestly solicited.

U.S. Appln. Serial No. 10/801,769
Response to Office Action dated June 21, 2005
Page 3 of 6

3. **Conclusion and Petition for Extension of Time.**

Applicants respectfully submit that with the arguments and amendments presented herein all pending claims are allowable over the art of record and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.


If the Examiner believes that a teleconference would be of further value in expediting the allowance of the pending claims, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number listed below. Applicants hereby petition for a two-month extension of time to file this response. The three-month statutory period for response was September 21, 2005. A one-month extension of time was requested with the response filed on October 21, 2005. Applicants request an additional extension of time until November 21, 2005 to file this response for a total of two-months. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the extension of time fees for a large entity to Deposit Account No. (Reference #8929-3049).

Respectfully submitted,

OPPENHEIMER, WOLFF & DONNELLY LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

Dated: November 14, 2005

By



Barbara A. Wrigley, Reg. No. 34,950
45 South 7th Street, Suite 3300
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone No. (612) 607-7595
Facsimile No. (612) 607-7100
E-Mail Bwrigley@Oppenheimer.com

Customer No. 34205